

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Examiner stated that claims 1-12, 14, 16-20 and 22-26 are pending in this application, claims 1, 17, and 22 are independent claims and that 1, 17, and 22 were amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner stated that claims 1-12, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner stated that claim 1 recited the limitation “display region” in lines 6 and 7 and there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. However, claim 7 contains no reference to a “display region”, while claim 10 contains a reference to a “display region.” Applicant has amended claims 6 and 10 to correct the antecedent basis issue. Applicant kindly requests removal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner stated that claims 1-12, 14, 16, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (“Sasaki” US 7451181) in view of Screen Dumps of Windows Media Player 9 used on Windows XP (“Windows”).

The Examiner stated that claims 17-20, 22-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers et al. (“Rodgers”, US PGPUB # 2002/0026478 A1) in view of Screen Dumps of Windows Media Player 9 used on Windows XP (“Windows”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

As stated in MPEP § 2143.01, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Examiner states that as per claim 1, which applies equally to independent claims 11 and 22 in the discussion set forth below, that Sasaki discloses “one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region.” However, Sasaki does not disclose the limitation set forth above and therefore Applicant’s invention is patentable distinct under 37 CFR 1.111(b) as will set forth in detail below.

Sasaki states partially in the portion quoted by the Examiner (See FIG. 5, elements 44, 45, 46 and 47 and the accompanying description, Col. 9, ll. 30-49, Col. 10, ll. 4-12) that “The window 41 of shared space associates windows of shared applications and displays them together, so that the windows 42 of the shared applications are displayed as sub-windows within the window 41 of the shared space. Moreover, ***the window 41 of shared space includes icons and buttons for various operation inputs by the user relating to the shared application.*** In the example in FIG. 5, it includes an operation authority button 44, an application list button 45, a candidates-for-sharing list button 46, and a end button 47. The operation authority button 44 is for performing input of a request for acquiring operation authority, which is the authority for operating the window 41 of shared space. By pushing the operation authority button, the

operation authority acquiring portion 31 of the shared-window controlling portion 24 tries to acquire operation authority. It is preferable that if it has obtained the operation authority, the operation authority controlling portion 32 manages the operation authority, and inform the user of the acquisition of the operation authority for example by reversing its display or by changing its color.” Col. 10, ll. 4-12 state the following *“In the example in FIG. 5, the application list button 45 is displayed within the window 41 of shared space, but it can also be provided outside the window 41 of shared space, for example near the start button 49 in the lower left corner of the display screen. Pushing the candidates-for-sharing list button 46 displays a list of the currently unshared local applications, which, if selected by the user, are automatically put into sharing and displayed in the shared window.”* Several issues arise from the Sasaki disclosure cited above, all of which clearly illustrate the distinctions from Applicant’s invention.

First, as states clearly in the claims and illustrated in FIG. 3B, Applicant’s *claimed invention requires “one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region.”* Sasaki simply does not contain this element. Sasaki states that “Moreover, the *window 41 of shared space includes icons and buttons for various operation inputs by the user relating to the shared application.* In the example in FIG. 5, it includes an operation authority button 44, an application list button 45, a candidates-for-sharing list button 46, and a end button 47.” Applicant’s claimed invention states that “one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region.” *The shared space has no control buttons.* Thus, the Examiner is completely wrong is his analysis. The Examiner has not done this, instead he has distilled the invention down to a gist or a thrust of the invention. *Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue requires interpreting the claim language, and*

considering both the invention and the prior art references as a whole. See MPEP § 2111 - § 2116.01 for case law pertaining to claim interpretation. The Examiner is not looking at the claimed invention as a whole, but rather distilling the invention down to a *gist* or *thrust* of the invention and completely disregarding the “as a whole requirement.” See MPEP § 2111. The above-mentioned claim issue are enough to distinguish Applicant’s invention under 37 CFR 1.111(b).

Moreover, the Examiner states that with regard to the element (or portion thereof) “wherein the remote user is able to use most of the remote user viewer display to view contents of a remaining portion of the local user display region.” In the section quoted from Col. 10 in Sasaki states that the application list button, etc. can be moved near the start button in the lower left portion of the display screen. In this case, the disclosure of Sasaki *teaches away* from Applicant’s invention entirely. *Applicant’s invention as claim states that the control areas are displayed within the taskbar region. They are not displayed in any other area of the local user display.* A prior art reference must be *considered in its entirety*, i.e., as *a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention.* W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Again, apart from the fact that Sasaki teaches away from Applicant’s invention, the fact that the Examiner has quoted a portion of the disclosure to support obviousness issue are enough to distinguish Applicant’s invention under 37 CFR 1.111(b).

Moreover, the Examiner states that Sasaki does not teach a task bar region within the display region; and one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region; wherein a local user is able to maximize the taskbar region. In

contrast, the Examiner has stated *again* that *Sasaki does teach the button 46, which is used to control the display region, can be near the start button.* The Examiner did not read the disclosure to comprehend what was meant by the control areas. He could not have, *because this is in direct contrast, both to the claims* and the specification. “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” (In re Kahn, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006) cited with approval in KSR).

However, purely in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the instant invention, Applicant has amended claims 1, 17 and 22 to include the substantially the following limitations:

1. (Currently Amended) A user interface on a display device for application sharing in a multimedia collaboration system, wherein the user interface, comprises:

a local user display region, wherein the local user display region is divided into at least three regions, the regions comprise the entire display and do not intersect, the three regions comprising;

a taskbar region;

a desktop region, wherein the taskbar region represents an area of which is outside a desktop region; and

a toolbar region, wherein the toolbar region includes the entire display besides the taskbar region;

a remote user display region;

~~a taskbar region within the display region;~~

~~a the desktop region within the local user display region; and~~

one or more control areas, displayed within the taskbar region, used to control the display region;

wherein a local user is able to maximize the taskbar region and use most of the local user display region on tasks related to session control and document previews that are not visible or accessible to a remote user; and

wherein the remote user is able to use most of the remote user viewer display to view contents of a remaining portion of the local user display region.

Support for such limitations can be found at least on pages 5-8 of the instant invention.

Neither Sasaki et al., Screen Dumps of Windows Media Player 9 used on Windows XP and Rodgers teach or suggest such limitations. As such, Applicant believes that claims 1, 17 and 22 as well as the that depend from claims 1, 17 and 22 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance. In light of the arguments set forth below, Applicant traverses each and every claim, depending from claims 1, 17 and 22.

As such, Applicant respectfully believes that these claims, as well as the claims that depend from them, are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WEST CORPORATION

Date: April 8, 2009

By: /Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: (972) 849-1310